

712



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/817,308	03/31/2004	Brian L. Schmidt	MSI-1944US	1844
22801	7590	12/21/2006		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER BATAILLE, PIERRE MICHE	
			ART UNIT 2186	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 12/21/2006	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/817,308

Applicant(s)

SCHMIDT ET AL.

Examiner

Pierre-Michel Bataille

Art Unit

2186

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 05 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,5-15 and 18-46.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Pierre-Michel Bataille  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 2186

**Advisory Action**

1. This Office Action is to respond to applicant communication filed 05 December 2006 responding to as Final Rejection dated 05 October 2006.

**Response to Arguments**

2. Applicant argues that the applied reference by Grigorovich (US 2005/0066063) does not disclose a section in the claims as bold-highlighted below:

***wherein the first type of information pertains to information that is designated for retrieval in a streaming transfer mode, and the second type of information pertains to information that is designated for retrieval in a bulk transfer mode.***

Please note the part of the independent claim 1 is of the general nature or caching in association of a main memory, i.e. a system having a cache and main memory wherein it is determined to process a request for information (1) in cache if the requested segment is in cache (low latency) and (2) in main memory if not in cache memory and the cache memory storing (a) a first type of information and (b) a second type of information. Please note that, as noted, the recited claimed features are common in caching system and that there is no doubt that Grigorovich would teach otherwise because Grigorovich's system uses (1) a media cache module providing intermediate data structure for retrieving streaming media file, (2) the system

determines whether streaming media file exists in cache as requested, and (3) the system identifies five types of data structure stored in cache (see section 0056).

Applicant argues that the reference by Grigorovich fail to teach the first type of information is designated for retrieval in a streaming transfer mode and the second type of information is designated for retrieval in a bulk transfer mode. Please note that bulk, by definition, defines quantity, or large numbers. Therefore, one person of ordinary skill in the art would consider a bulk transfer mode as the disclosed "more complex streaming media files. Applicant admits that Grigorovich discloses a more complex streaming media file to include multiple videos and/or audio streams.

Applicant further agrees that, and as is also relevant in Grigorovich disclosure, Grigorovich discloses an intelligent streaming mode involving switching between multiple streams. It is clearly understood that the intelligent transfer mode involves streaming of data files where "multiple streams are transferred at times". However, BULK by definition also involves multiple, or a plurality, or a group of. Therefore, The rejection with respect to the statute 102 is proper.

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Michel Bataille whose telephone number is (571) 272-4178. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00A to 4:30P).

Art Unit: 2186

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew M. Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Pierre-Michel Bataille  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2186

December 14, 2006

**PIERRE BATAILLE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**